

Landowner Incentive Program (FY05)
Grant Proposal National Review Team Ranking Criteria Guidance

State: _____

Tier 2 Grant Proposals

Review and Scoring Based on Criteria

- a) Proposal provides clear and sufficient detail to describe the program. States are encouraged to describe any projects that are part of a broader scale conservation effort at the State or regional level (10 points total).
- Proposal is easy to understand and contains all elements described in 522 FW 1.3C (0-2 pts)
 - The objectives are clearly stated and have quantifiable outcomes (0-2 pts)
 - Proposal clearly describes the types of conservation projects and/or activities eligible for funding (0-2 pts).
 - Proposal clearly describes how conservation projects and/or activities will implement portions of conservation plans at a local, state, regional or national scale (0-2 pts)
 - Proposal describes how species and habitats will be monitored and evaluated to determine effectiveness of LIP-sponsored activities (0-2 pts)
-
- b) Proposal describes adequate management systems for fiscal, contractual, and performance accountability, including annual monitoring and evaluation of progress toward desired program objectives and performance measures and goals identified in the “expected results or benefits” section of the grant application (7 points total).
- Fiscal accountability processes are clearly described (0-2 pts)
 - Contractual accountability standards and processes are clearly described (0-2 pts)
 - Monitoring processes that will ensure accurate and timely evaluation of program performance are clearly described (0-3 pts)
- c) Proposal describes the State’s fair and equitable system for fund distribution (10 points total).
- System described is inherently fair and free from bias (0-3 pts)
 - Proposal describes State’s ranking criteria and process to select projects (0-3 pts)
 - States’ ranking criteria are adequate to prioritize projects based on conservation priorities identified in proposal (0-2 pts)
 - Project proposals will be (or were) subject to an objective ranking procedure (diverse ranking panel, computerized ranking model, etc.) (0-2 pts)
- d) Proposal describes outreach efforts to effect broad public awareness, support, and participation (2 points total). LIP Outreach efforts funded with Tier 1 grants or other funding sources can be described.

- e) Proposal describes by name the species-at-risk to benefit from the proposal and how the described activities would benefit *each* species (10 points total).

0 points if no species are identified
5 points if 1-5 species are identified
6 points for 6 species
7 points for 7 species
8 points for 8 species
9 points for 9 species
10 points for 10 or more species

(Note: assign fewer points if a proposal merely has a long list attached versus one that talks about what will be done for those species and their habitats on private lands if the proposal were funded.)

- f) Proposal describes the percentage of the State's total LIP Tier-2 program funds identified for use on private lands as opposed to staff and related administrative support (4 points total).

0 points if this is not addressed or admin is >35%
1 point if admin is 25 to 35%
2 points if admin is 15 to 25%
3 points if admin is 5 to 15 %
4 points if admin is 0 to 5% admin

("Use on private lands" include all costs directly related to implementing on-the-ground projects with LIP funds. Activities considered project use include: technical guidance to landowner applicants; habitat restoration, enhancement or management; purchase of conservation easements (including costs for appraisals, land survey, legal review, etc); biological monitoring of Tier 2 project sites; performance monitoring of Tier 2 projects. Staffing costs should only be included in this category when the staff-time will directly relate to implementation of a Tier 2 project. Standard Indirect rates negotiated between the State and Federal government should also be included under Project Use. "Staff and related administrative support" include all costs related to administration of LIP. Activities considered administrative include outreach (presentations, development or printing of brochures, etc.); planning; research; administrative staff support; staff supervision; overhead charged by subgrantees unless the rate is an approved negotiated rate for Federal grants.)

- g) Proposal identifies the percentage of nonfederal cost sharing (3 points total).

(Note: I.T.=Insular Territories)

0 point if nonfederal cost share is 25%
1 points if nonfederal cost share is >25% to 50% (>0 to 25% I.T.)
2 points if non federal cost share is >50% to 75% (>25 to 50% I.T.)
3 points if nonfederal cost share is >75% nonfed share (>50% I.T.)

h) Proposal demonstrates the urgency of the conservation actions, and the short and long term benefits to be gained (10 points total).

- Proposal shows no, low, medium or high urgency of need for identified at-risk species (0-3 pts)
- Proposal shows no or some short-term benefits to be achieved (0-1 pt)
- Proposal shows no or some long-term benefits to be achieved (0-1 pt)
- Proposal describes discrete, obtainable and quantifiable performance measures to be accomplished (for example, the number of acres of wetlands or stream miles to be restored, or number of at-risk species whose status within the State will be improved) (0-2 pts)
- Proposal, taken as a whole, demonstrates that the State can implement a Landowner Incentive Program that has a high likelihood for success in conserving at-risk species on private lands (0-3 pts)

i. Has applicant received Tier 2 grant funds previously? (5 points total)

- a) If State has received Tier 2 funds previously 0 points
- b) If State has not received Tier-2 funds previously 1, 3 or 5 points
 - If State has not applied for Tier-2 funds previously 1 point
 - If State has applied one of two previous years 3 points
 - State has applied both previous years 5 points

Total Score Possible = 61 points

Total Score _____

